Information Item

Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee

Faculty Salaries in California Public Universities, 2001-2002

In accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 of the 1965 General Legislative Session, the Commission reports annually on the lag between the salaries paid to faculty at the California State University and the University of California and those projected to be paid at each system's group of comparison institutions.

Preliminary parity figures for both systems are reported to the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst during December of each year. A draft report is sent to the Commission in February, with a final report produced in April.

This report is presented as a Higher Education Update and shows that the current estimated parity figures projected for 2001-2002 reflect a lag of 7.9 percent in faculty salaries for the California State University, and a lag of 4.0 percent at the University of California, relative to their respective comparison institutions.

Presenter: William L. Storey.

HIGHER EDUCATION UPDATE

NUMBER UP/01-1 FEBRUARY 2001



News from the

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

Alan Arkatov, Chair
Carol Chandler, Vice Chair
Phillip J. Forhan
Robert A. Hanff
Lance Izumi
Kyo "Paul" Jhin
Monica Lozano
Velma Montoya
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.
Evonne Schulze
Khyl Smeby
Howard Welinsky
Melinda G. Wilson

Warren H. Fox *Executive Director*

1303 J Street, Suite 500 Sacramento, California 95814-2938 Telephone (916) 445-7933 (Voice) FAX Number (916) 327-4417

Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2001-02

EACH YEAR, in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 of the 1965 General Legislative Session, the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC) submit to the California Postsecondary Education Commission information on faculty salaries for their respective institutions and for a set of comparison colleges and universities located primarily outside of California.

On the basis of this information, Commission staff develops estimates of the percentage changes in faculty salaries in California public universities that will enable them to attain parity with their respective comparison groups in the forthcoming fiscal year. Current procedures dictate that initial parity figures for both systems, which are normally based on incomplete data from the comparison institutions, be reported to the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst during December of each year. A preliminary report is then submitted to the Commission in February, with a more complete report produced in April.

This document represents the preliminary report on faculty salary compensation for the current (2000-01) and budget (2001-02) fiscal years. The report also contains a brief description of the methodology employed to calculate the parity percentages and the faculty salary increase trends over the past 20 years. Supplemental Budget Language adopted by the Legislature in 1998 precludes changes in the methodology prior to the 2002-03 budget cycle. In effect, because of the lengthy lead times required to develop the Governor's Budget, this means that if any changes in the methodology are contemplated for 2002-03, discussions among the members of the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee should begin in the spring of 2001.

A summary of the methodology

The faculty salary methodology includes two separate comparison institution groups – one each for the California State University and the University of California. The procedures by which the systems collect data, and the techniques used to analyze those data, have been designed and refined periodically by the Commission – and the Coordinating Council before it – in consultation with the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee. The Committee includes representatives from the California State University, the University of California, the Department of Finance, and the Office of the Legislative Analyst, with the California Faculty Association included on the Committee as an observer. As a result, the faculty salary methodology is reflective of several compromises among interested parties rather than the vision of any single individual or agency.

This year's methodology is unchanged from the last several years, and can be found in considerable detail in several previous Commission reports. These include the June 1987 report *Faculty Salary Revisions* (CPEC 87-27), the

June 1989 report *Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology* (CPEC 89-22), and the 1997 faculty salary report (CPEC 97-2), which includes the 1996-97 adjustments (there have been no revisions since that cycle).

The methodology consists of two primary elements: (1) collecting salary data from the comparison institutions;

and (2) a computational process that involves the weighting of several data elements by various factors, such as the number of faculty at each rank.

Display 1 below shows the comparison institutions for the two university systems. Each is a list formulated through extensive discussions and compromises by the members of the Commission's Faculty Salary Advisory Committee.

DISPLAY 1 Faculty Salary Comparison Institutions for the California State University and the University of California

The California State University

Northeast Region

Bucknell University*

Rutgers, the State University of

New Jersey, Newark

State University of New York,

Albany

Tufts University*

University of Connecticut

Southern Region
Georgia State University
George Mason University
North Carolina State University
University of Maryland,
Baltimore County

North Central Region

Cleveland State University
Illinois State University
Loyola University, Chicago*
Wayne State University
University of Wisconsin,
Milwaukee

Western Region
Arizona State University
Reed College*
University of Colorado, Denver
University of Nevada, Reno
University of Southern California*
University of Texas, Arlington

University of California

Harvard University*
Massachusetts Institute
of Technology*
Stanford University*
State University of New York,
Buffalo
University of Illinois, Urbana
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
University of Virginia, Charlottesville
Yale University*

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

In the more than 30 years that the survey has been conducted, each list has changed numerous times, most recently in 1993-94 when three State University institutions were replaced. The University of California list is unchanged since 1988, when Cornell and the University of Wisconsin, Madison were replaced by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the University of Virginia.

The computational process includes a determination of current average salaries, by rank, in both the California systems and the comparison institutions, with each rank's average projected forward one year based on the previous five-year growth rate. The projected 2001-02 average rank-by-rank salaries for the comparison institutions are then compared to the current-year State University and University averages. These averages are then combined into an "All Ranks Average" for each comparison group and California system and compared for the current and budget years. Comparing the projected average for the comparison group next year with the current-year

average for the California system produces the budgetyear "parity figure."

Faculty salary trends

Display 2 on the next page shows the Commission's salary computations for each of the two university systems, plus the actual amounts granted, since the 1981-82 fiscal year.

During the first half of the 1980s, the salary lag between the California State University and its comparison group was consistently smaller than the comparable lag for the University of California and its group. However, by the late 1980s, this situation had reversed. During California's severe economic recession between 1991-92 and 1994-95, few if any faculty salary increases were funded in State budgets. This worsened the compensation deficiency between faculty at California's institutions and their comparison groups to create the largest compensation

^{*} Independent Institution.

DISPLAY 2 Comparison of Faculty Salary Parity Figures, with Actual Percentage Increases Provided, 1980-81 Through 2001-02

	The Cali State Uni		Unive of Calif	-
		Salary		Salary
Year	Parity Figure	<u>Increase</u>	Parity Figure	<u>Increase</u>
1981-82	0.5%	6.0%	5.8%	6.0%
1982-83	2.3	0.0	9.8	0.0
1983-84	9.2	6.0	18.5	7.0
1984-85	7.6	10.0	10.6	9.0
1985-86	N/A	10.5	6.5	9.5
1986-87	6.9	6.8	1.4	5.0
1987-88	6.9	6.9	2.0	5.6
1988-89	4.7	4.7	3.0	3.0
1989-90	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
1990-91	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
1991-92	4.1	0.0	3.5	0.0
1992-93	6.0	0.0	6.7	0.0
1993-94	8.5	3.0	6.5	0.0
1994-95	6.8	0.0	12.6	3.0
1995-96	12.7	2.5	10.4	3.0
1996-97	9.6	4.0	10.3	5.0
1997-98	10.8	4.0	6.7	5.0
1998-99	11.2	5.7	4.6	4.5
1990-00	11.1	6.0	2.9	2.9
2000-01	8.9	6.0	3.0	3.0
2001-02	7.9	N/A	4.0	N/A

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission

disparity since the inflationary era of the 1970s and early 1980s.

Since 1994-95, as California transitioned from recession to economic boom, faculty have again received more competitive percentage salary increases, with slightly larger increases accruing to faculty at the University of California. As a result of this trend, the parity figure has declined significantly during this period for faculty at both university systems. The University's parity gap last year was 3.0 percent and the currently projected lag is 4.0 percent for 2001-02. At the State University, whose faculty this year will receive a projected average salary increase of 6.0 percent, the lag has lessened from 8.9 percent last year to a projection of 7.9 percent in the upcoming 2001-02 fiscal year.

It is important to understand the meaning of these "parity" numbers. Last year, when the Commission reported an estimated lag of 8.9 percent parity figure for Califor-

nia State University faculty, it did not mean that the State University's faculty were actually paid 8.9 percent less than their colleagues in comparable institutions. This figure was a projection of a possible future (2000-01) lag based on observed trends over a five-year period, with the assumption that State University salaries would not increase at all in the 2000-01 fiscal year. The current lag – discussed below for 2000-01 – can be quite different from the projected lag, and normally shows a lower percentage than anticipated for the budget year, with the potential of there being no lag at all.

The parity figures for 2000-01

California State University

Display 3 on the next page shows the parity calculations for the California State University for the current (2000-01) and budget (2001-02) fiscal years.

The "parity figure" for the State University system in 2001-02 is estimated to be 7.9 percent – the percentage by which average salaries in the State University would have to increase to equal the average salaries projected to be paid by the comparison institutions in 2001-02. It also indicates that average salaries in the current year are, on the average, about 3.9 percent below those currently paid by the comparison group. These calculations are based upon actual information received from 17 of the State University's 20 comparison institutions and estimated data for the remaining three.

Displays 4 and 5 on the following pages show rank-by-rank and institution-by-institution salaries for both the State University and the comparison group in 1995-96 and 2000-01. These data are used to determine the five-year compounded average growth rate that permits current-year salaries to be projected into the budget year. The shaded lines in both displays indicate the State University's relative position overall to the entire list. It shows that the State University remains in 11th place, exactly at the median of its 20 comparison institutions.

For the current year, faculty at each individual rank (except for the few remaining instructors) all fall below the median, ranging from 14th to 19th place. However, the State University's overall average remains at the median because of the fact that the State University has nearly 55 percent of its faculty at the full professor rank, while the comparison institutions as a group have, on average, just over 37 percent at that rank.

DISPLAY 3 California State University Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1995-96 and 200-01; Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2001-02; and Projected CSU Faculty Salary Percentage Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2001-02

Academic Rank Professor	Comparison Group Average Salaries 1995-96 ¹ \$73,339	Comparison Group Average Salaries 2000-01 ¹ \$89,290		Compound Rate of Increase 4.0%	Comparison Group Projected Salaries 2001-02 \$92,874		
Associate Professor	\$53,943	\$64.	,642	3.7%	\$67,025		
Assistant Professor	\$44,400	\$53,	,296	3.7%	\$55,279		
Instructor	\$34,385	\$39,	,195	2.7%	\$40,234		
	California State University Actual	_	son Group <u>e Salaries</u>	California State Salaries to Equ	crease Required in University Average al the Comparison ion Average		
Academic Rank	Average Salaries 2000-01 ³	Actual <u>2000-01</u>	Projected 2001-02	Actual <u>2000-01</u>	Projected 2001-02		
Professor	\$80,302	\$89,290	\$92,874	11.2%	15.7%		
Associate Professor	\$64,683	\$64,642	\$67,025	-0.1%	3.6%		
Assistant Professor	\$51,932	\$53,296	\$55,279	2.6%	6.4%		
Instructor	\$40,206	\$39,195	\$40,234	-2.5%	0.1%		
Weighted by State University Staffing	\$69,067	\$74,249	\$77,132	7.5%	11.7%		
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	\$66,291	\$69,941	\$72,616	5.5%	9.5%		
All Ranks Average/Net Percentage Amount ²	\$68,373	\$71,018	\$73,745	3.9%	7.9%		
nstitutional Current-Year Staffing Pattern (Headcount Faculty)	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Total		
California State University *Percent*	6,050 54.6%	1,885 17.0%	2,659 24.0%	490 4.4%	11,084 100.0%		
Comparison Institutions Percent	4,688 37.4%	4,165 33.2%	3,167 25.3%	518 4.1%	12,538 100.0%		

^{1.} Weighted 58% high-cost institutions, 42% low-cost institutions.

Source: CPEC staff analysis

^{2. &}quot;All-Ranks Average" salaries are derived by weighting the State University and Comparison Institutions by 75 % of their own staffing pattern and 25% of the comparison institution's staffing pattern.

^{3.} The salary estimates for the end of 2000-01 are projected as being 11.4% above Fall 1999 (not 2000) average salaries at each rank.

DISPLAY 4 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 1995-96

Institution	P No.	rofessors Avera Salary (r	_	Associate Professors Average No. Salary (rank)		Assistant Professors Average No. Salary (rank)			<u>I</u> No.	nstructors Avera Salary (r	ge	Total	Weighted Salary (ra		
Institution J ¹	109	\$89,976	(1)	112	\$68,165	(1)	89	\$54,509	(1)	17	\$41,196	(5)	327	\$70,316	(1)
Institution Q ¹	472	82,806	(2)	349	59,783	(3)	260	50,625	(2)	38	45,361	(3)	1,119	66,877	(2)
Institution B ¹	486	80,558	(3)	346	60,851	(2)	230	47,556	(3)	6	46,669	(1)	1,068	66,876	(3)
Institution N	283	75,506	(7)	198	55,356	(5)	95	43,556	(9)	0	0		576	63,310	(4)
Institution P ¹	112	78,543	(5)	120	58,135	(4)	66	43,685	(8)	0	0		298	62,605	(5)
Institution R ¹	211	79,251	(4)	264	54,952	(6)	134	43,097	(13)	49	34,810	(7)	658	58,830	(6)
Institution K	483	70,834	(11)	341	51,080	(12)	233	44,072	(5)	17	33,742	(12)	1,074	58,169	(7)
Institution S ¹	288	71,132	(10)	270	54,850	(7)	200	44,836	(4)	19	41,812	(4)	777	57,989	(8)
Institution G ¹	152	76,137	(6)	213	54,406	(8)	142	43,349	(11)	3	34,200	(10)	510	57,685	(9)
Institution M ¹	144	70,696	(12)	127	51,988	(11)	86	41,661	(16)	2	45,895	(2)	359	56,984	(10)
CSU	6,706	\$62,293	(19)	2,032	\$49,979	(14)	1,520	\$40,854	(17)	150	\$32,734	(14)	10,408	\$56,332	(11)
Institution C	84	71,430	(9)	88	53,550	(9)	80	43,468	(10)	1	33,000	(13)	253	56,217	(12)
Institution F	235	74,311	(8)	250	52,101	(10)	235	43,128	(12)	34	34,106	(11)	754	55,415	(13)
Institution A	593	65,901	(14)	463	49,302	(16)	262	41,895	(15)	41	27,631	(18)	1,359	54,463	(14)
Institution T	277	63,909	(17)	314	50,938	(13)	150	43,958	(7)	5	34,526	(9)	746	54,241	(15)
Institution L	55	63,910	(16)	22	47,539	(19)	33	40,742	(18)	1	35,865	(6)	111	53,525	(16)
Institution I ¹	99	67,972	(13)	129	48,978	(18)	91	42,925	(14)	28	31,125	(15)	347	51,369	(17)
Institution D	146	62,499	(18)	198	49,266	(17)	113	40,432	(19)	17	30,976	(16)	474	50,580	(18)
Institution E ¹	104	65,334	(15)	114	49,612	(15)	107	43,990	(6)	49	34,807	(8)	374	50,436	(19)
Institution H	290	58,681	(21)	194	45,837	(20)	217	39,529	(20)	7	28,472	(17)	708	48,993	(20)
Institution O	211	62,038	(20)	213	44,839	(21)	147	37,326	(21)	44	25,492	(19)	615	47,560	(21)
Totals	11,057	\$66,150		6,016	\$52,249		4,257	\$42,829		511	\$33,791		21,841	\$57,019	
High cost 10	2,177	\$77,779		2,044	\$56,757		1,405	\$46,213		211	\$37,799		5,837	\$61,374	\Box
Low cost 10	2,657	67,209		2,281	50,058		1,565	41,896	-	167	29,671		6,670	54,464	.
Total	4,834	\$73,339		4,325	\$53,943	_	2,970	\$44,400		378	\$34,385		12,507	\$58,472	

^{1.} Universities located in higher cost areas.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor

DISPLAY 5 California State University Comparison Institution Salary Data, by Rank, 2000-01

Institution	P No.	Professors Averag Salary (ra	ا ر	Associ	ate Professors Average Salary (rank)			Assistant Professors Average No. Salary (rank)		Instructors Average No. Salary (rank)		Total	Weighted Salary (ra		
Institution J ¹	136	\$109,511	(1)	119	\$81,330		93	\$62,664		35	\$44,292	(5)	383	\$83,420	(1)
Institution Q ¹	522	102,235	(2)	330	71,196	(3)	241	62,707	(1)	36	47,852	(2)	1,129	82,990	(2)
Institution B ¹	436	95,969	(5)	339	71,920	(2)	256	56,193	(3)	19	50,854	(1)	1,050	77,690	(3)
Institution P ¹	129	91,140	(6)	118	66,765	(5)	64	50,883	(13)	0	0		311	73,607	(4)
Institution K	424	90,377	(7)	330	66,310	(6)	244	56,057	(4)	17	41,963	(7)	1,015	73,491	(5)
Institution N	223	88,770	(8)	186	62,997	(10)	97	53,147	(6)	0	0		506	72,467	(6)
Institution R ¹	236	97,747	(4)	251	67,524	(4)	168	51,881	(10)	79	43,750	(6)	734	71,102	(7)
Institution M ¹	165	85,544	(9)	130	62,468	(11)	103	50,011	(14)	4	39,107	(14)	402	68,515	(8)
Institution A	603	83,994	(13)	414	60,831	(13)	277	52,284	(8)	48	37,455	(11)	1,342	68,639	(9)
Institution S ¹	268	85,970	(11)	250	66,056	(7)	198	51,685	(11)	32	45,663	(3)	748	68,514	(10)
CSU	6,324	\$75,950	(19)	1,897	\$60,717	(14)	2,305	\$49,181	(17)	401	\$38,403	(8)	10,927	\$66,281	(11)
Institution I ¹	120	86,199	(10)	122	61,100	(12)	119	52,307	(7)	25	37,763	(9)	386	64,681	(12)
Institution F	177	99,609	(3)	282	64,160	(8)	300	53,582	(5)	92	33,260	(16)	851	64,463	(13)
Institution G ¹	144	82,654	(14)	235	60,015	(16)	115	50,214	(15)	0	0		494	64,333	(14)
Institution C	70	84,521	(12)	103	63,875	(9)	109	51,667	(12)	2	45,605	(4)	284	64,150	(15)
Institution T	246	78,062	(15)	268	60,468	(15)	180	51,976	(9)	9	36,876	(12)	703	64,148	(16)
Institution O	211	77,164	(17)	170	56,328	(20)	110	49,430	(16)	5	34,972	(15)	496	63,447	(17)
Institution L	50	76,630	(18)	27	57,384	(18)	44	48,301	(19)	0	0		121	62,034	(18)
Institution D	155	71,578	(20)	184	56,350	(19)	109	45,473	(21)	6	37,490	(10)	454	58,688	(19)
Institution H	252	68,817	(21)	190	53,906	(21)	243	46,246	(20)	0	0		685	56,674	(20)
Institution E ¹	121	77,583	(16)	117	57,479	(17)	97	49,003	(18)	109	35,621	(13)	444	55,740	(21)
Totals	10,847	\$81,126		5,932	\$63,007		5,369	\$51,365		915	\$39,100		23,063	\$67,870	
High cost 10	2,277	\$93,859		2,011	\$67,279		1,454	\$54,632		339	\$41,710		6,081	\$75,048	\neg
Low cost 10	2,411	82,980		2,154	61,001	ı	1,713	51,450	•	179	35,721		6,457	63,840	.
Total	4,688	\$89,290	_	4,165	\$64,642		3,167	\$53,296		518	\$39,195		12,538	\$70,340	_

^{1.} Universities located in higher cost areas.

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor

University of California

Display 6 on the next page shows the parity calculations for the University of California for both the current and budget years. For the University system, the methodology indicates a "parity figure" of 4.0 percent, which indicates the percentage amount by which University faculty will lag their counterparts if no salary increase is granted for 2001-02. The display also indicates that University average salaries are about equal to the comparison group — leading by only 0.3 percent — in the 2000-01 fiscal year.

Display 7 on page 9 presents 1995-96 and 2000-01 comparison institution data, by rank, and indicates that the University has slightly improved its median position over this five-year period, rising from sixth place five years ago to fifth in the current year. There is no change from last year in the public/independent relationship relative to faculty salaries – that is, each of the independent institutions pays more than any of the public institutions.

It may be noted that the University's rank-by-rank position relative to its comparison institutions is more consistent than it is with the State University. For example, where in the current year the University's all-ranks aver-

age is at the median – fifth of nine listed, including the University of California – of the comparison institutions listed, it is also sixth for full professors, seventh for associate professors, and sixth for assistant professors. By contrast, the State University's all ranks average is 11th in the current year, but 19th for full professors, 14th for associate professors, and 17th for assistant professors. The consistency of the University's position occurs because the distribution of faculty at each professorial rank in that system is similar to the distribution of faculty in its eight comparison institutions. As noted above, that similarity is not as evident in the State University distribution, since a higher percentage have been awarded full professor appointments.

By April, Commission staff anticipates that it will receive from the systemwide offices final data for all of the State University and University comparison institutions, along with any corrections or updates of the information provided for this preliminary report. These data will be used to revise the faculty salary parity figures provided here and to produce this year's final California Postsecondary Education Commission report on faculty salaries for publication.

DISPLAY 6 University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1995-96 and 2000-01; Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 2001-02; and Projected UC Faculty Salary Percentage Increase Required to Attain Parity with the Comparison Group in 2001-02

	Compariso <u>Average</u>	_	Compound Rate	. Compariso	on Group
Academic Rank	1995-96 ¹	$2000-01^{1}$	of Increase	Projected Sala	ries, 2001-02
Professor	\$89,318	\$110,077	4.3%	\$114,7	775
Associate Professor	\$60,301	\$74,365	4.3%	\$77,5	49
Assistant Professor	\$50,609	\$62,038	4.2%	\$64,6	17
	University of Calif. Average		ison Group <u>e Salaries</u>	Percent Increas University Ave. So the Compariso Aver	alaries to Equal n <u>Institution</u> age
Academic Rank	Salaries, 2000-01	Actual 2000-01	Projected 2001-02	Actual 2000-01	Projected 2001-02
Professor	\$107,643	\$110,077	\$114,775	2.3%	6.6%
Associate Professor	\$71,457	\$74,365	\$77,549	4.1%	8.5%
Assistant Professor	\$62,669	\$62,038	\$64,617	-1.0%	3.1%
Weighted by University of California Staffing	\$92,879	\$94,911	\$98,953	2.2%	6.5%
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	\$88,688	\$90,476	\$94,323	2.0%	6.4%
All Ranks Average/Net Percentage Amount ²	\$91,832	\$91,585	\$95,480	-0.3%	4.0%
Institutional Budget-Year S (Full-Time-Equivalent		<u>Professor</u>	Associate Professor	Assistant <u>Professor</u>	<u>Total</u>
University of California		3,756.2	1,221.4	969.5	5,947.1
Percent		63.2%	20.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Comparison Institutions		4,318.5	1,771.3	1,973.0	8,062.8
Percent		53.6%	22.0%	24.5%	100.0%

^{1.} Weighted 50% public comparison institutions, 50% independent comparison institutions. The University of California Office of the President reports that it has final survey results from seven of its eight comparison institutions and has estimated final results for the eight institution.

Source: CPEC staff analysis

^{2.} All-Ranks Average derived by weighting University and Comparison Institutions by 75 percent of their own staffing pattern and 25 percent of the other's staffing pattern.

DISPLAY 7 University of California Comparison Institution Average Salaries and Ranking, 1995-96 and 2000-01

<u>1995-96</u>	Type ¹	Pro Number	ofessor Salary	Rank	Associate Number	Professor Salary	Rank	<u>Assistan</u> Number	t Professor Salary	Rank	Total Number	l Faculty Salary	Rank
Institution H	I	580	\$108,081	1	132	\$62,734	3	181	\$57,103	1	893	\$91,046	1
Institution A	I	484	\$101,603	2	140	\$68,960	1	154	\$55,319	2	778	\$86,567	2
Institution F	I	581	\$97,341	3	156	\$67,226	2	178	\$53,863	3	915	\$83,749	3
Institution D	I	359	\$95,591	4	104	\$56,515	6	175	\$47,565	5	638	\$76,048	4
Univ. of Calif.	P	3,190	\$79,383	6	1,197	\$53,309	7	960	\$46,185	6	5,347	\$67,586	6
Institution E	P	692	\$81,721	5	336	\$63,833	4	351	\$54,076	4	1,379	\$70,326	5
Institution C	P	313	\$79,237	7	248	\$56,324	5	156	\$43,963	7	717	\$63,655	7
Institution G	P	871	\$74,378	9	491	\$53,187	8	378	\$45,895	8	1,740	\$62,214	8
Institution B	P	429	\$75,609	8	286	\$51,953	9	188	\$42,966	9	903	\$61,316	9
Totals		4,309.2	\$89,318		1,892.8	\$60,301		1,760.4	\$50,609		7,962.4	\$74,774	
	190	Pro	ofessor	ıķ	Associate	Professor	ık	Assistan	t Professor	ık	Total	l Faculty	ık
<u>2000-01</u>	Type ¹	Pro Number	ofessor Salary	Rank	Associate Number	e Professor Salary	Rank	<u>Assistan</u> Number	t Professor Salary	Rank	<u>Total</u> Number	l Faculty Salary	Rank
2000-01 Institution H	I Type ¹			Rank			Rank			Rank		•	Rank
		Number	Salary		Number	Salary		Number	Salary		Number	Salary	$\overline{}$
Institution H	I	Number 641	Salary \$130,480	1	Number 111	Salary \$79,979	2	Number 233	Salary \$70,453	2	Number 985	Salary \$110,590	1
Institution H Institution A	I I	Number 641 510	\$130,480 \$121,698	1 2	Number 111 126	\$79,979 \$87,809	2	233 214	\$70,453 \$68,008	2	985 850	Salary \$110,590 \$103,157	1 2
Institution H Institution A Institution F	I I I	641 510 553	\$130,480 \$121,698 \$117,647	1 2 3	Number 111 126 180	\$79,979 \$87,809 \$78,750	2 1 3	233 214 169	\$70,453 \$68,008 \$72,280	2 3 1	985 850 902	Salary \$110,590 \$103,157 \$101,385	1 2 3
Institution H Institution A Institution F Institution D	I I I	641 510 553 385	\$130,480 \$121,698 \$117,647 \$117,286	1 2 3 4	111 126 180 69	\$79,979 \$87,809 \$78,750 \$71,045	2 1 3 6	233 214 169 182	\$10,453 \$68,008 \$72,280 \$58,165	2 3 1 5	985 850 902 636	\$110,590 \$103,157 \$101,385 \$95,351	1 2 3 4
Institution H Institution A Institution F Institution D Univ. of Calif.	I I I I	Number 641 510 553 385 3,756	\$130,480 \$121,698 \$117,647 \$117,286 \$107,643	1 2 3 4 5	Number 111 126 180 69 1,221	\$79,979 \$87,809 \$78,750 \$71,045 \$71,457	2 1 3 6 5	233 214 169 182 970	\$70,453 \$68,008 \$72,280 \$58,165 \$62,669	2 3 1 5 4	985 850 902 636 5,947	\$110,590 \$103,157 \$101,385 \$95,351 \$92,879	1 2 3 4 5
Institution H Institution A Institution F Institution D Univ. of Calif. Institution E ²	I I I I P P	Number 641 510 553 385 3,756 693	\$130,480 \$121,698 \$117,647 \$117,286 \$107,643 \$100,887	1 2 3 4 5	Number 111 126 180 69 1,221 364	\$79,979 \$87,809 \$78,750 \$71,045 \$71,457 \$73,080	2 1 3 6 5 4	Number 233 214 169 182 970 415	\$70,453 \$68,008 \$72,280 \$58,165 \$62,669 \$57,919	2 3 1 5 4	985 850 902 636 5,947	\$110,590 \$103,157 \$101,385 \$95,351 \$92,879 \$81,897	1 2 3 4 5
Institution H Institution A Institution F Institution D Univ. of Calif. Institution E ² Institution B	I I I I P P P	Number 641 510 553 385 3,756 693 453	\$130,480 \$121,698 \$117,647 \$117,286 \$107,643 \$100,887 \$101,666	1 2 3 4 5 7 6	Number 111 126 180 69 1,221 364 261	\$79,979 \$87,809 \$78,750 \$71,045 \$71,457 \$73,080 \$70,045	2 1 3 6 5 4 7	Number 233 214 169 182 970 415 220	\$70,453 \$68,008 \$72,280 \$58,165 \$62,669 \$57,919 \$56,902	2 3 1 5 4 6 7	985 850 902 636 5,947 1,472 934	\$110,590 \$103,157 \$101,385 \$95,351 \$92,879 \$81,897 \$82,264	1 2 3 4 5 7 6

 $^{1. \ \} I = Independent; \ P = Public.$

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

^{2.} Estimated data.